

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-29 were pending, that claims 2-10, 12-26, 28 and 29 have been withdrawn from consideration, and rejected claims 1, 11 and 27. Claims 1, 11, and 27 have been amended and new claim 30 has been added, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 11, 27 and 30 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Holmquest. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Parker.

Figure 2 of Holmquest has a lamp lead that passes through a toroid T5 to detect an output current through the lamp lead.

Parker discusses a magnetically coupled current sensing circuit 64/66 for detecting a circuit anomaly (ground fault detection) along with an inverter 52 supplying high frequency current to a neon lamp where the detecting is based on a detecting of the circuit current whether or not an anomaly exists in a current route including the load.

In contrast, claim 1 emphasizes that the method allows magnetic flux change occurring in circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor in the vicinity of the circuit wiring where the magnetic flux change occurs due to a change in the circuit through the medium of the magnetic flux change by the detecting conductor. ("allowing magnetic flux change occurring to a circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor arranged in the vicinity of the circuit wiring, the magnetic flux change occurring because of a change in a circuit current due to discharge" - claim 1). Holmquest and Parker do not teach or suggest a structure allowing magnetic flux change occurring in a circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor in the vicinity of the circuit wiring.

Claims 11 and 27 also emphasize this distinction.

It is submitted that present claims 1, 11 and 27 patentably distinguish over Holmquest or Parker and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

New claim 32 emphasizes a method allowing a magnetic flux change produced by a circuit to act on a detecting conductor located in a vicinity of the circuit, with the magnetic flux change occurring due to a change in a circuit current due to a discharge and detecting the change in the circuit current through the medium of the magnetic flux change on the detecting

conductor. Holmquest or Parker doe not teach or suggest such.

It is submitted that the are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 5, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501